

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 are pending in the instant application after this amendment adds new claims 11-16. The new claims do not add new matter and are supported throughout the specification and figures. In view of the amendments and the following remarks, favorable reconsideration of this case is respectfully requested.

Applicants note with appreciation that the Examiner acknowledges that claims 2-4, 6, 7, and 10 are directed to patentable subject matter.

Claim 1, 5, 8, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over United States Patent No. 6,078,806 to Heinonen (hereinafter referred to as Heinonen) in view of United States Patent Publication No. 2003/0183691 to Lahteenmaki (hereinafter referred to as Lahteenmaki). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 1 relates to a portable telephone terminal device that includes, *inter alia*, a recording medium adapted to record information of a subscriber. The portable telephone terminal device of claim 1 also includes *means for restricting execution of a service* that incurs payment, except for a telephone call service, *based on information indicative of a master-slave relation* recorded in said recording medium.

The Examiner asserts that Heinonen discloses a method and/or a portable telephone terminal device comprising: a recording medium adapted to record information of a subscriber and/or arrangement for receiving request for a special fee (Office Action; page 2, sect. 3, citing col. 2, lines 7-16). The Examiner asserts that Lahteenmaki discloses the method and/or a portable telephone terminal device comprising a recording medium adapted to record information of a subscriber. The Examiner asserts that Heinonen discloses a well known arrangement for receiving and/or master-slave relation the recording medium. However, it appears that the citation

should have been to Lahteenmaki (Lahteenmaki; paragraph 0068). Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that Heinonen does not disclose or suggest any feature of a master-slave relation. Clarification of the citation allegedly disclosing this feature is respectfully requested in the next Office communication.

The master/slave relationship discussed in Lahteenmaki relates to communication between two devices, for example between a wireless communications terminal and a smart card reader and between a smart card reader and a smart card. Lahteenmaki does not appear to disclose or suggest *means for restricting execution of a service based on information indicative of a master-slave relation*. Lahteenmaki apparently only discloses particular devices having a master or slave relationship with respect to other particular devices during communication between the devices. Lahteenmaki does not disclose or suggest that execution of a service is restricted based on an indicator of a master-slave relation. As discussed above, Heinonen does not disclose or suggest any feature of a master-slave relation. Therefore, Applicants submit that none of the references disclose or suggest this feature of claim 1, and therefore for at least this reason, claim 1 is allowable over the combination of the references.

Additionally, the Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time of the invention to provide above teaching of Lahteenmaki to Heinonen to implement use of a well known master/slave communication or relation or protocol so that an arrangement is designed to enable electronic payment of purchases made with a mobile terminal or mobile phone (Office Action, page 3, lines 1-5, citing Lahteenmaki; paragraph 0004). Applicants submit that the alleged motivation to combine the references is insufficient to support the combination. Applicants assert that the only motivation to combine the

references results from the instant specification, and that this motivation results from improper hindsight reasoning.

Claims 5 and 9 include features similar to those discussed above in regard to claim 1, and therefore, for at least the same reasons as claim 1 is allowable, claims 5 and 9 are also allowable.

Claim 8 depends from claim 5 and is therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 5 is allowable.

New claims 11-16 depend from one of claims 1, 5, and 9, and therefore each of these claims is allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims are allowable. Additionally, claims 11, 13, and 15 each include the feature that the master-slave relation is between the portable telephone terminal device and a second terminal device, or a similar feature. It is respectfully submitted that Heinonen does not disclose or suggest a master-slave relation, and that Lahteenmaki's disclosure relating to a master-slave relation is apparently directed to the relationship between two dissimilar devices communicating, for instance a wireless device, a smart card reader, and a smart card. Therefore, Lahteenmaki does not disclose a master-slave relation between two terminal devices, as recited in the new claims. Therefore, for at least this additional reason claims 11, 13, and 15 are allowable.

Additionally, claims 12, 14, and 16 each depend from claims 11, 13, and 15, respectively, and include the feature that the portable telephone terminal device and the second terminal device do not communicate directly, or a similar feature. It is respectfully submitted that Heinonen does not disclose or suggest a master-slave relation, and that Lahteenmaki's disclosure relating to a master-slave relation is apparently directed to the relationship between two dissimilar devices communicating directly, for instance a wireless device, a smart card reader, and a smart card. Therefore, Lahteenmaki does not disclose that the portable telephone terminal

device and the second terminal device do not communicate directly, as recited in the new claims.


Therefore, for at least this additional reason claims 12, 14, and 16 are allowable.

CONCLUSION

In view of the remarks set forth above, this application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested. However, if for any reason the Examiner should consider this application not to be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below prior to issuing a further Action.

Any fee due with this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1290.

Respectfully submitted,



Brian E. Hennessey
Reg. No. 51,271

CUSTOMER NO.: 026304

Telephone No.: (212) 940-6311

Fax No.: (212) 940-8986/7

Docket No.: 100806-00240 (NEKO 20.738)

BEH:pm